

To: Way, Steven[way.steven@epa.gov]; Myers, Craig[Myers.Craig@epa.gov]; Petri, Elliott[Elliott.Petri@WestonSolutions.com]; Guy, Kerry[Guy.Kerry@epa.gov]
Cc: Marilyn Smith[m.smith@erllc.com]
From: Matt Francis
Sent: Mon 9/7/2015 8:34:26 PM
Subject: RE: Pipeline award

Has someone verified the need for SDR7 pipe for potential pressurization beyond SDR11 capability? A statement evaluating the validity of that design detail provided by APTec would be helpful.

The benefit I could see of a second line to Gladstone would be the potential to tie in water from Red and Bonita. If the plan to shut the valve at RnB gets shelved, that water could go to whatever treatment we have set up in Gladstone assuming the treatment infrastructure is capable/expandable. Otherwise, I'd opt for clean out ports strategically installed on the single line to alleviate possible plugs. I would think that the top, Wye and any low spots on the way to Gladstone would be the potential plug locations. Based on APTec, the cost of installing the second line now vs later is \$8K plus a second mobilization and whatever inflation occurs. Based on HW, the cost would be just the second move/inflation – their line costs are equal for both the primary and redundant.

From: Way, Steven [mailto:way.steven@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, September 07, 2015 9:01 AM
To: Matt Francis <m.francis@erllc.com>; Myers, Craig <Myers.Craig@epa.gov>; Guy, Kerry <Guy.Kerry@epa.gov>; Petri, Elliott <Elliott.Petri@WestonSolutions.com>
Cc: Marilyn Smith <m.smith@erllc.com>
Subject: RE: Pipeline award

Matt and others,

As for the selection of APTec, has ER analyzed the proposal, in addition to the technical review by START, and concluded that it is the better value? In particular, did ER account for the completeness of services versus the next lower bid that requires substantial work to be performed by ER?

Secondly, as to a decision not to include 2 lines to Gladstone, this was pending the technical

reviews. One factor that needed to be considered and is the pipe capacity. We need to confirm the flow capacity of the 6 inch line as it approaches Gladstone. START please verify the estimated capacity of the single 6 inch line. Also, what is the increased cost to run 2 lines to the Gladstone only, and is there reason to consider a second line only from the base of the slope (laydown area) to Gladstone versus the entire line from the portal ?

Let's resolve this on Tuesday morning.

Thank you,

Steve

Steven Way

Federal On-Scene Coordinator

Emergency Response Unit

US EPA - Region 8

1595 Wynkoop Street

Denver, CO 80202

Office: 303-312-6723

From: Matt Francis [<mailto:m.francis@erllc.com>]

Sent: Monday, September 07, 2015 6:51 AM

To: Myers, Craig; Guy, Kerry; Petri, Elliott

Cc: Way, Steven; Marilyn Smith

Subject: Pipeline award

I want to make sure we are all in agreement before I talk to APTEC tomorrow morning about the pipeline. Items to clarify:

- 1) APTEC provided the best proposal based on START and EPA technical review
- 2) APTEC schedule is acceptable
- 3) The configuration to be constructed is all 3 sections without redundancy. One line from GK to a junction point at the "laydown area." In the laydown area the line will T or wye and go to both the Red & Bonita Pond as well as Gladstone. There will not be a second line for any of the sections and the line to Gladstone will remain 6".

Something we need to consider is where the line will terminate in Gladstone. Should it terminate at the new ponds or, if we are going to set with Alexco, should we plan now to take it to the Quonset hit? I realize this is a decision that hasn't been made yet, but we need to make it soon. Let me know if you are in agreement with items 1- 3 items above .

Thanks

Matt Francis

Environmental Restoration, LLC

303.994.6611

Confidentiality Warning: This e-mail and any attachments contain information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this e-mail is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, any dissemination, publication or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Although this email has been scanned for malware, the sender does not accept any responsibility for any loss, disruption or damage to your data or computer system that may occur while using data contained in, or transmitted with, this e-mail. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify by return e-mail. Thank you.